

Neutrino Oscillations and Flavor Structure of Supersymmetry without R-Parity

Otto C. W. Kong

Department of Physics and Astronomy,

University of Rochester, Rochester NY 14627-0171

Abstract

Focusing on a simple three neutrino oscillation scenario motivated by the recent Super-Kamiokande result, we discuss both tree-level and 1-loop contributions to neutrino masses in supersymmetry without R-parity, aiming at discerning the flavor structure issues of the theory. The single-VEV parametrization framework, which allows the first consistent treatment of the bilinear and trilinear R-parity violating terms, and hence the tree and 1-loop contributions, without any assumption on the nature of R-parity violation. Though the very small neutrino masses implies stringent suppressions of the relevant R-parity violating couplings, we show that there is still room for understanding the suppressions as a simple consequence of the general flavor hierarchy.

The recent zenith angle dependence measurement by the Super-Kamiokande (SuperK) experiment [1] has drawn much attention to neutrino oscillations, particularly the scenario of three neutrino oscillations explaining the SuperK result and the solar neutrino deficit [2]. The scenario is described by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 &\simeq (0.5 - 6) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2 \\ \sin^2 2\theta_{\text{atm}} &\simeq (0.82 - 1) \\ \Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 &\simeq (4 - 10) \times 10^{-6} \text{ eV}^2 \\ \sin^2 2\theta_{\text{sol}} &\simeq (0.12 - 1.2) \times 10^{-2}\end{aligned}$$

with $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ to be responsible for the Super-K atmospheric result and MSW-oscillation of ν_e for the solar neutrino problem. The most natural setting then would be for the two neutrino mass eigenvalues of the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ system to have $m^2 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2$ and Δm_{atm}^2 . We will concentrate on this particular scenario below.

When supersymmetry (SUSY) is adjoined to the standard model (SM), lepton number violation couplings naturally give rise to neutrino masses, unless the couplings are banned, such as by imposing R-parity. The subject is of much interest on its own [3–5]. In a recent paper [6], the generation of exactly the above three neutrino oscillation scenario from R-parity violation is analyzed. The analysis has unification scale assumptions on R-parity violation and makes some use of the flavor structure of the R-parity violating (RPV) couplings. In our opinion, flavor structure of the full theory of SUSY without R-parity could be a tricky problem and deserves more attention.

Most of the RPV couplings have to be small [7], compare with their R-parity conserving counter-parts. However, apart from the baryon violating couplings, their smallness may not be particularly remarkable compared with that of the standard Yukawa couplings giving rise to masses of the lighter-two-family fermions. In fact, the suggestion that the smallness of all the couplings may be understood from a simple approximate flavor symmetry perspective had been made [8]. Nevertheless, an explicit analysis of the type is missing. Actually, a framework that allows the explicit phenomenological studies of the *complete* supersymmet-

ric model without R-parity, *i.e.* with no *a priori* assumption on vanishing of any of the admissible RPV couplings taken, is presented only in a recent paper [9].

The present paper is the first attempt at an explicit analysis of the feasibility of an approximate flavor symmetry perspective on the complete supersymmetric standard model without R-parity. This is done here, only in the limited context of fitting the above described three neutrino oscillation scenario. Besides the great interest in the latter, our analysis also illustrates some basic issues in the flavor structure of SUSY without R-parity that would be useful for further studies on the topic. Naively, the neutrino oscillation scenario, with the very small neutrino masses, seems to indicate a very stringent suppression in R-parity violation [10]. So this limited context, though relatively simple, may actually represent an extreme case of small R-parity violation and hence the difficult end of the spectrum for the approximate flavor symmetry perspective. Result of our analysis, hence, serves as a strong indicator for the more general cases. We should point out that in a complementary perspective, there has also been some horizontal (family) symmetry model-building works addressing various aspect of R-parity violation [11,12].

The most general renormalizable superpotential for the supersymmetric SM without R-parity can be written as

$$W = \varepsilon_{ab} \left[\mu_\alpha \hat{L}_\alpha^a \hat{H}_u^b + h_{ik}^u \hat{Q}_i^a \hat{H}_u^b \hat{U}_k^c + \lambda'_{\alpha ik} \hat{Q}_i^a \hat{L}_\alpha^b \hat{D}_k^c + \lambda_{\alpha\beta k} \hat{L}_\alpha^a \hat{L}_\beta^b \hat{E}_k^c \right] + \lambda''_{ijk} \hat{D}_i^c \hat{D}_j^c \hat{U}_k^c, \quad (1)$$

where (a, b) are $SU(2)$ indices, (i, j, k) are family (flavor) indices, while (α, β) are (extended) flavor indices from 0 to 3 with $\hat{L}_\alpha$'s denote the four doublet superfields with $Y = -1/2$. λ and λ'' are antisymmetric in the first two indices as required by $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ product rules respectively, though only the former is shown explicitly here, $\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, while the $SU(3)$ indices are suppressed. At the limit where $\lambda_{ijk}, \lambda'_{ijk}, \lambda''_{ijk}$ and μ_i all vanish, one recovers the expression for the R-parity preserving MSSM, with $\hat{L}_0$ identified as $\hat{H}_d$. The latter, however, should be treated as a fourth flavor of $\hat{L}$ -type, as in our notation.

In the single-VEV parametrization [9], flavor bases are chosen such that: 1/ among $\hat{L}_\alpha$'s,

only the $\hat{L}_0$, bears a VEV; 2/ $h_{ik}^e (\equiv 2\lambda_{i0k} = -2\lambda_{0ik}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v_d} \text{diag}\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$; 3/ $h_{ik}^d (\equiv \lambda'_{i0k}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v_d} \text{diag}\{m_d, m_s, m_b\}$; 4/ $h_{ik}^u = \frac{-\sqrt{2}}{v_u} V_{CKM}^\dagger \text{diag}\{m_u, m_c, m_t\}$. The number of parameters used is minimal, and the (tree-level) mass matrices for *all* the fermions *do not* involve any trilinear RPV coupling. The parametrization hence provides a tractable framework for the analysis of the *complete* theory of SUSY with R-parity *without any assumption*, verses models of various forms of R-parity violation, as discussed in Ref. [9]. We want to emphasize here that, unlike most of R-parity violation studies, the approach makes *no assumption* on any RPV coupling including those from soft SUSY breaking, and all the parameters used are uniquely definite as a set of flavor bases is explicitly chosen.

Here we write the neutral fermion (neutralino-neutrino) mass matrix as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & \frac{g_1 v_u}{2} & -\frac{g_1 v_d}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 & -\frac{g_2 v_u}{2} & \frac{g_2 v_d}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{g_1 v_u}{2} & -\frac{g_2 v_u}{2} & 0 & -\mu_0 & -\mu_1 & -\mu_2 & -\mu_3 \\ -\frac{g_1 v_d}{2} & \frac{g_2 v_d}{2} & -\mu_0 & W & 0 & Y & Z \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu_2 & Y & 0 & A & C \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu_3 & Z & 0 & C & B \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

with the basis vector $\Psi_0^T = (-i\lambda', -i\lambda_3, \psi_{H_u}^2, \psi_{L_0}^1, \psi_{L_1}^1, \psi_{L_2}^1, \psi_{L_3}^1)$ where $-i\lambda'$ and $-i\lambda_3$ are the unmixed bino and neutral wino states, the rest are the neutral components of the doublets (the upper index is a $SU(2)$ one). Parameters A , B , and C , and W , Y , and Z are two groups of relevant 1-loop contributions to be discussed below. When these parameters are set to zero, one recover the tree-level result. In the limit where the μ_i 's also vanish, we have the R-parity conservating result and $\psi_{L_i}^1$'s are exactly the (three) neutrino states, $\psi_{H_u}^2$ and $\psi_{L_0}^1$ are the two higgsino states. Having μ_i 's small compare to the electroweak scale also implies the $\psi_{L_i}^2$'s are basically the physical charged leptons ($\ell_i = e, \mu$, and τ) [9]. Note that the tree-level result here is *exact*. We have made no assumption on the other VEV's, for example. We simply go to a base where they vanish. As for the 1-loop contributions,

we neglect those related to the first family — the “ ν_e ”. The latter is expected to be not relevant for the Super-K atmospheric neutrino result.

At tree level, only two eigenvalues of $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{N}$ remain zero. One neutrino state acquires a mass through a “see-saw” mechanism. The (massive) neutrino state is given by

$$|\nu_5\rangle = \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_5} |\psi_{L_1}^1\rangle + \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_5} |\psi_{L_2}^1\rangle + \frac{\mu_3}{\mu_5} |\psi_{L_3}^1\rangle , \quad (3)$$

where

$$\mu_5 = \sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 + \mu_3^2} . \quad (4)$$

The important point to note here is that (at tree-level) the massive neutrino is an admixture of the three $\psi_{L_i}^1$ ’s, which correspond to ν_e , ν_μ , and ν_τ at the limit of small μ_i ’s; and the ν_μ and ν_τ content, for example, of the massive neutrino is given by $\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_5}$ and $\frac{\mu_3}{\mu_5}$ respectively.

Actually, one can extract the effective neutrino mass matrix by considering $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{N}$ of Eq.(2) in the $3 + 4$ block form $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M} & \xi^T \\ \xi & m_\nu^0 \end{pmatrix}$, with the explicit “see-saw” type structure. Up to first order, we have

$$m_\nu = -\xi \mathcal{M} \xi^T + m_\nu^0 . \quad (5)$$

Since the “heavy” neutrino should not contain much of ν_e , we assume μ_1 to be negligible. To simplify the analysis, we drop any reference to the ν_e state and contract the mass matrices accordingly; *i.e.* m_ν^0 and ξ are now considered as 2×2 and 2×4 matrices. When only tree-level contribution is considered, we have $m_\nu^0 = 0$. Then m_ν is given from the pure “see-saw” contribution and the result is a matrix of the form

$$\Xi = \begin{pmatrix} a^2 & ab \\ ab & b^2 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (6)$$

This form of matrix is particularly important in our discussions below. It suffices to note that it is diagonalized by a rotation of angle θ with $\tan\theta = a/b$, to give eigenvalues 0 and $a^2 + b^2$. In the case here, $a : b = \mu_2 : \mu_3$, and the nonvanishing eigenvalue is the neutrino mass

$$m_{\nu_5} \simeq -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu_5^2 v^2 \cos^2 \beta (xg_2^2 + g_1^2)}{\mu_0 [2xM_2\mu_0 - (xg_2^2 + g_1^2) v^2 \sin \beta \cos \beta]} , \quad (7)$$

where we have substituted $v_d = v \cos \beta$, $v_u = v \sin \beta$, and $M_1 = xM_2$. If this is the dominating contribution to m_ν , for the neutrino oscillation scenario we are interested in here, we expect $m_{\nu_5}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2$. Eq.(7) then gives

$$\mu_5 \cos \beta \sim 10^{-4} \text{ GeV} . \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\sin 2\theta_{\text{atm}} = \frac{2\mu_2\mu_3}{\mu_5^2} , \quad (9)$$

giving

$$\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3} \gtrsim 0.6358 . \quad (10)$$

From the above analysis, we have arrived at the first interesting point about the flavor structure : fitting the neutrino oscillations suggests

$$\mu_1 \ll \mu_2 \sim \mu_3 \quad (\ll \mu_0) .$$

Remember that our μ_α 's as mass-couplings for the $\hat{L}_\alpha \hat{H}_u$ terms are written in the base where the three $\hat{L}_i$'s correspond, up to negligibly small perturbation by the μ_i 's, to the ℓ_i mass eigenstates [9]. The flavor structure among the μ_i 's then marks a clear deviation from the simple hierarchical pattern down the three families.

At 1-loop level, all three neutrinos are expected to be massive. Studies of the 1-loop contributions to neutrino masses from R-parity violation has been quite a popular topic [4,5]. However, they are usually done in the context of models of specific forms of R-parity violation, with typically assumptions on the vanishing of the bilinear RPV terms and/or “sneutrino ” VEV's. Otherwise, they are studied as contributions to individual entries of the neutral fermion mass matrix with all family indices taken to be in the mass eigenstate basis of the charged lepton, a feature that makes them incompatible with the analysis of

the tree-level contributions from the bilinear RPV terms as the latter modify the nature of the charged lepton states too. A consistent framework to handle both the tree and 1-loop contributions together without any assumption on the nature of R-parity violation is provided by the single-VEV parametrization summarized above. Reader are referred to ref. [9] for more details. In the limit of small μ_i 's, as is the case for the neutrino oscillation scenario addressed here. The single-VEV basis for the neutral fermion mass matrix $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{N}$ is an excellent approximation of the ν_e - ν_μ - ν_τ basis. Hence, we can simply adopt the some of the available results for expressions of mass matrix entries like A , B , and C in Eq.(2) in terms of the trilinear RPV couplings. Entries like W , Y , and Z are commonly neglected. Their stucture are similar to the other ones. We will check and show that they are really negligible, at least in the present context.

The λ and λ' RPV couplings give rise to the following 1-loop contributions to the 4×4 Majorana mass matrix of the $\psi_{L\alpha}^1$'s

$$(m^{LL})_{\alpha\beta}^\ell = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \lambda_{i\alpha j} \lambda_{j\beta i} \left(\frac{A_j^\ell m_i^\ell}{\tilde{m}_{\ell_j}^2} + \frac{A_i^\ell m_j^\ell}{\tilde{m}_{\ell_i}^2} \right), \quad (11)$$

$$(m^{LL})_{\alpha\beta}^q = \frac{3}{16\pi^2} \lambda'_{i\alpha j} \lambda'_{j\beta i} \left(\frac{A_j^d m_i^d}{\tilde{m}_{q_j}^2} + \frac{A_i^d m_j^d}{\tilde{m}_{q_i}^2} \right). \quad (12)$$

Here, m_i^ℓ and m_i^d are the charged lepton and down-sector quark masses respectively, A_i^ℓ and A_i^d their corresponding slepton and squark mixing terms, and $\tilde{m}_{\ell_i}^2$ and $\tilde{m}_{q_i}^2$ the corresponding slepton and squark loop mass factors. These 1-loop results are written down for couplings in the mass eigenstate bases of the quarks and charged leptons. Recall that in the small μ_i limit of interest here, the bases coincide with that of the single-VEV parametrization. We have dropped contributions involving off-diagonal A^d or A^ℓ , adopting the common assumption that they are negligible. Matrix m^{LL} corresponds to the lower 4×4 -block of $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{N}$ given in Eq.(2).

Ref. [6] has concentrated on the effects of the λ'_{3i3} couplings. It is obvious that they give the dominating contributions to $(m^{LL})^q$, for reasonable values of the SUSY parameters. Amazing enough, their contribution to m_ν^0 is also of the form given by Ξ [*cf.* Eq.(6)]. Explicitly, we have

$$(m_\nu^0)^q \simeq \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \frac{m_b^2}{M_{SUSY}} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda'_{33}{}^2 & \lambda'_{33} \lambda'_{33} \\ \lambda'_{33} \lambda'_{33} & \lambda'_{33}{}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where M_{SUSY} denotes some SUSY scale mass. The λ' 's at the order of 10^{-5} is then relevant for our neutrino oscillation scenario. At 10^{-4} , they could be the dominating contribution to m_ν . In that case, fitting $\sin 2\theta_{\text{atm}}$ requires $\frac{\lambda'_{33}}{\lambda_{33}} \gtrsim 0.6358$ [*cf.* Eqs.(9) and (10)].

The contributions from the lepton loops are actually more interesting. Because of the antisymmetry of the first two indices in the λ 's, we have

$$(m_\nu^0)^\ell \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi^2 M_{SUSY}} \begin{pmatrix} m_\tau^2 \lambda_{33}^2 & -m_\mu m_\tau \lambda_{32} \lambda_{33} \\ -m_\mu m_\tau \lambda_{32} \lambda_{33} & m_\mu^2 \lambda_{32}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

It still has the same matrix form of Ξ but now the $a : b$ ratio is expected to be at least $m_\tau : m_\mu$, meaning that fitting $\sin 2\theta_{\text{atm}}$ using this as the dominating contribution is hopeless. Having λ 's of the order 10^{-4} would still make them relevant to the neutrino oscillation scenario, generating the lighter neutrino masses. It is of particular interest to note the strong anti-hierarchy among the matrix elements. The antisymmetry of the λ 's uniquely forbids the m_τ contributions to the ν_τ mass terms, singling out the contribution to the ν_μ mass.

So far, we discuss only the part of m^{LL} contributing to m_ν^0 , without ν_e . They correspond to parameters A , B , and C in Eq.(2). The other parts of m^{LL} actually have larger contributions, but to parameters W , Y , and Z . For example, $(m^{LL})_{00}^q \simeq \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \frac{m_b^2}{M_{SUSY}} \lambda'_{33}{}^2 \sim 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}$ (note: λ'_{33} is the bottom Yukawa) contributes to W , which then marks a negligible contribution to $\mathcal{M}$ in Eq.(5). Similarly, $(m^{LL})_{0i}^q \simeq \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \frac{m_b^2}{M_{SUSY}} \lambda'_{33} \lambda'_{33}$ contributes to Y and Z . For $\lambda'_{33} \sim 10^{-4}$, Y and $Z \sim 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}$. However, they come into m_ν through ξ in Eq.(5), like the μ_i 's. Comparison with Eq.(8) then indicates that they are really negligible. Similar contributions from $(m^{LL})^\ell$ have even further suppressions from antisymmetry of the λ 's indices. All loop contributions to mass terms involving ν_e are expected to be much suppressed as a result of the flavor structure discussed below.

After analyzing the various sources of neutrino masses, let us look at the flavor structure

more carefully. The idea of the approximate flavor symmetry approach [8] is to attach a suppression factor to each chiral multiplet, such as ε_{L_i} 's to the L_i 's and $\varepsilon_{E_i^c}$'s to the E_i^c 's; here multiplets are *not* mass eigenstates. The hierarchical structure of the Yukawa couplings giving rise to the fermion masses is then described by the hierarchy among the ε 's for the multiplets of the same type. We want to see if fitting the neutrino oscillation scenario could still be compatible with the overall flavor structure, and if we could learn something more about the scenario, using the approach.

With SUSY, the suppression factors go with the superfields. Without R-parity, we have four $\hat{L}$ flavors with $\varepsilon_{L_0} \gg \varepsilon_{L_i}$. Let us start by considering, for example, two leptonic doublets L_i' and L_j' going with flavor factors ε_{L_i} and ε_{L_j} . The corresponding $m_\ell m_\ell^\dagger$ matrix again has the form Ξ of Eq.(6) with $a : b = \varepsilon_{L_i} : \varepsilon_{L_j}$, to be diagonalized by a rotation of angle given by $\tan\theta_{ij} = \varepsilon_{L_i}/\varepsilon_{L_j}$. When $\varepsilon_{L_i} \ll \varepsilon_{L_j}$, replacing L_i' and L_j' by the mass eigenstates L_i and L_j simply makes the ε_{L_i} and ε_{L_j} factors go along with L_i and L_j (see also Ref. [8]). With $\varepsilon_{L_i} \sim \varepsilon_{L_j}$, however, the factors that go with L_i and L_j would be $\sin 2\theta_{ij} \sqrt{\varepsilon_{L_i}^2 + \varepsilon_{L_j}^2}$ and $\cos 2\theta_{ij} \sqrt{\varepsilon_{L_i}^2 + \varepsilon_{L_j}^2}$, which are of course still of the same order of magnitude as ε_{L_i} and ε_{L_j} .

Our neutrino oscillation scenario, together with the known charged lepton masses, suggests

$$\varepsilon_{L_1} \ll \varepsilon_{L_2} \sim \varepsilon_{L_3} \ll \varepsilon_{L_0} ,$$

and

$$\varepsilon_{E_1^c} \ll \varepsilon_{E_2^c} \ll \varepsilon_{E_3^c} .$$

If we naively take $\frac{m_\tau}{m_t}$ as roughly the suppression factor for L_3 , namely $\cos 2\theta_{23} \sqrt{\varepsilon_{L_2}^2 + \varepsilon_{L_3}^2}$, we obtain the kind of maximum suppression in the λ and λ' couplings from the approximate flavor symmetry perspective. This requires $\varepsilon_{E_3^c} \sim 1$, and hence $\varepsilon_{E_2^c} \sim \frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}$. We have then the natural suppressions: $\lambda'_{33} \sim \lambda'_{32} \sim 5 \times 10^{-4}$ (taking also m_b/m_t into $\varepsilon_{Q_3} \varepsilon_{D_3^c}$); $\lambda_{323} \sim 10^{-4}$; and $\lambda_{322} \sim 10^{-5}$. From the discussions above, we see that only the λ' 's are marginally too large. But then we have used a very conservative value of 100 GeV for M_{SUSY} of Eq.(13) above, and some numerical factors close to unity actually go with the ε 's to give the exact

couplings. It seems then the interplay among the relevant SUSY parameters could take care of the problem. Much stronger suppression for any coupling involving L_1 is obvious, hence justifying their being neglected in our analysis here.

Now we turn to the μ_i 's, though trying to understand the suppressions of these bilinear couplings from the same framework represents a much more ambitious program. The origin of the general μ -terms may actually related to SUSY breaking (see, for example, Ref. [3]). However, it worths taking a look and see how far one can go. The flavor suppression factors involved in the μ_2 and μ_3 terms are $\sin 2\theta_{23}\sqrt{\varepsilon_{L_2}^2 + \varepsilon_{L_3}^2}$ and $\cos 2\theta_{23}\sqrt{\varepsilon_{L_2}^2 + \varepsilon_{L_3}^2}$ respectively. Eq.(8) requires $\mu_i/\mu_0 < 10^{-6}$, far beyond the suppressions of the order $\frac{m_\tau}{m_t}$. Nevertheless, we have not taken into the consideration of the rotation from the arbitrary L'_α 's one attach the ε_{L_α} 's to our single-VEV bases. A previous study [11] has shown that an alignment between the μ_α and the relevant soft SUSY breaking terms results in a similar alignment of the VEV's among the $\hat{L}_\alpha$'s. Translated into the single-VEV parametrization, that implies a suppression of the μ_i 's. An approximate flavor symmetry would provide the kind of alignment, though a detailed study is certainly called for to establish that a good enough alignment could be obtained for our purpose. Assuming that is the μ_i 's being the dominating contribution to m_ν with the right order to fit the oscillation scenario concerned here, then we have, from Eqs.(9) and (10) and the above discussions,

$$\sin 2\theta_{\text{atm}} \simeq 2 \sin 2\theta_{23} \cos 2\theta_{23} \simeq \frac{4\varepsilon_{L_2}\varepsilon_{L_3}(\varepsilon_{L_3}^2 - \varepsilon_{L_2}^2)}{(\varepsilon_{L_2}^2 + \varepsilon_{L_3}^2)^2}. \quad (15)$$

A quite interesting result.

Neutrino phenomenology could be more complicated than the simple scenario considered here. In such situations, the RPV couplings discussed above may not be as restricted. In particular, the μ_i 's, especially μ_3 , may be substantial and their contribution to m_i^ℓ 's not negligible. Unlike the case here, the larger values of the admissible RPV couplings might easily fit in the approximate flavor symmetry perspective. However, an analysis of the flavor structure issue there would be inevitably more involved. We hope to report on a more complete analysis in a future publication.

In summary, from our brief analysis here, we have illustrated a few interesting issues in the flavor structure of SUSY without R-parity. Though the suppressions of the RPV couplings for fitting the limiting scenario of neutrino oscillations, motivated by the recent Super-K result, are much stronger than other phenomenological constraints [7,10], there is still room for fitting them into an approximate flavor symmetry perspective. Success of the latter is a strong indication that the R-parity (or lepton number) violating couplings are “naturally” small, as the light fermion masses are, and their explanation most probably lies under a common theory of flavor structure.

M. Bisset and X.-G. He are to be thanked for discussions. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, under grant DE-FG02-91ER40685.

REFERENCES

- [1] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, Y. Fukuda et al., hep-ex/9803006; hep-ex/9805006; hep-ex/9807003; talk by T. Kajita at *Neutrino-98*, Takayama, Japan, June 1998.
- [2] See V. Barger, T.J. Weiler, and K. Whisnant, MADPH-98-1070, hep-ph/9807319, E. Ma, UCRHEP-T234, hep-ph/9807386; and references therein.
- [3] H.P. Nilles and N. Polonsky, Nucl. Phys. **B484**, 33 (1997); and references therein.
- [4] R. Hempfling, Nucl. Phys. **B478**, 3 (1996); B. de Carlos and P. White, Phys. Rev. **D 54**, 3427 (1996); E. Nardi, *ibid.* **D 55**, 5772 (1997).
- [5] A.S. Joshipura, V. Ravindran, and S.K. Vempati, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, R5327 (1998); M. Drees, S. Pakvasa, X. Tata, and T. ter Veldhuis, *ibid.* **D 57**, R5335 (1998); R. Adhikari and G. Omanović, IMSC/98/02/07, hep-ph/9802390.
- [6] E.J. Chun, S.K. Kang, C.W. Kim, and U.W. Lee, KIAS-P98014, hep-ph/9807327.
- [7] For some recent reviews and references, see G. Bhattacharyya, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **52A**, 83 (1997); H. Dreiner, hep-ph/9707435, to be published in *Perspectives on Supersymmetry*, edited by G. Kane, World Scientific.
- [8] A. Antaramian, L.J. Hall, and A. Rašin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 187 (1992); see also T.P. Cheng and M. Sher, Phys. Rev. **D 35**, 3484 (1987).
- [9] M. Bisset, O.C.W. Kong, C. Macesanu, and L.H. Orr, Phys. Lett. **B430**, 274 (1998); see also UR-1524 *in preparation*.
- [10] For example, see V. Bednyakov, A. Faessler, and S. Kovalenko, hep-ph/9808224.
- [11] T. Banks, Y. Grossman, E. Nardi, and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. **D 52**, 5319 (1995).
- [12] V. Ben-Hamo and Y. Nir, Phys. Lett. **B339**, 77 (1994); F.M. Borzumati, Y. Grossman, E. Nardi, and Y. Nir, *ibid.* **B384**, 123 (1996); H. Dreiner and A. Chamseddine, Nucl. Phys. **B458**, 65 (1996); P. Binetruy, S. Lavignac, and P. Ramond, *ibid.* **B477**, 353

(1996); E.J. Chun and A. Lukas, Phys. Lett. **B387**, 99 (1996); K. Choi, E.J. Chun, and H. Kim, *ibid.* **B394**, 89 (1997); G. Bhattacharyya, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 3944 (1998); J. Ellis, S. Lola, and G.G. Ross, CERN-TH/97-205, hep-ph/9803308.